



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,597	10/18/2001	Martin Lyons	13625/002001/107809	2866
20985	7590	03/28/2005	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, PC 12390 EL CAMINO REAL SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2081			BROCKETTI, JULIE K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3713	

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

52

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/035,597	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LYONS, MARTIN	
	<b>Examiner</b> Julie K Brockett	<b>Art Unit</b> 3713	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 15 February 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
- NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
 Julie K Brockett  
 Primary Examiner  
 Art Unit: 3713

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Examiner upholds the final rejection. While the Examiner does note the differences between the Okada patent and Applicant's invention. The broad claim language used by Applicant still reads on the Okada patent given the claims their broadest reasonable interpretation. For example, claim 1 states "a simulation system for running a simulation simulating playing of a game to simulate the entire playing of a game round from start to finish". Okada teaches this limitation in col. 4 lines 44-47; col. 5 lines 57-67; col. 7, lines 1-6 by generated simulated games just as they would an actual game. Okada teaches the limitation of "the simulation system enabling predetermined starting parameters to be set" in that when it runs a simulation it counts the hypothetical number of coins assumed to be inserted and stores this starting parameter in a first hypothetical coin counter. Okada teaches the limitation of "a comparator for comparing an end condition of said simulation run by the simulation system in an invisible manner using the starting parameteres, with a pre-calculated desired outcome of the game" by comparing the random number result of the simulated game which is "invisible" in that it is done with software not viewable to the player, with a probability table, i.e. desired outcome, to see if a "hit" occurred and if so what kind of a "hit". Okada teaches the limitation of "an adjustment means for adjusting the starting parameteres such that the end condition of a subsequent running of the simulation in a visible manner coincides with the end condition of the desired outcome of the game" by adjusting the first and second hypothetical counters based on the result of the previous game, the display 16 outputs the results of the simulations in a visible manner and clearly shows the end condition of the desired outcome of the game by showing how many coins were paid out. Claim 10 follows similar logic. While the Examiner appreciates the differences between Applicant's invention and the Okada reference, those differences are not clearly expressed in the claim language.